

## REMARKS

The Examiner rejected a number of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0077559 to Braunberger *et al.* In addition, the Examiner rejected additional claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Braunberger *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,077,085 to Parry *et al.*

In an effort to clarify the claimed invention, the Applicant has canceled all pending claims and added new claims 28 – 38. The newly submitted claims require presenting a keyword in a contextual presentation. The keyword has  $n$  characters, where  $n$  is greater than 2. The newly submitted claims also require presenting the contextual presentation without the keyword. Importantly, the newly submitted claims require receiving a first received character via a keyboard and then, before another character is received via the keyboard, determining if the first received character is equal to the first character of the keyword. If the two characters are equal, then a first indication is presented to the learner. If not, another indication is presented to the user.

Neither Braunberger *et al.* nor Parry *et al.* determine if the first character of a keyword is equal to a first received character. Importantly, neither reference performs such a determination before receiving any other character from the keyboard. To the contrary, Braunberger *et al.* only determines the correctness of an entire answer after the entire answer has been provided.

“If the student submits an answer through the Testing GUI, his answer is compared to an answer retrieved from the Testing database for the question presented (the answer in a question and answer pair, i.e., the ‘correct answer’). If the student’s answer matches the correct answer, ‘Correct’ is displayed on the Testing GUI and the user application is returned to the foreground and resumed.” Braunberger *et al.*, col. 3, lns. 1 – 8.

By waiting to determine if an entire answer is correct, Braunberger *et al.* provides the student with reinforcement of incorrect answers. For example, if a student enters an incorrect answer into Braunberger *et al.*, the student does not know if the answer is incorrect until the entire answer is entered. Thus the student sees the incorrect answer and the incorrect answer is improperly reinforced. On the other hand, the invention claimed in the newly submitted claims provides feedback if the student enters an incorrect first character of the answer before the

student enters the second character of the answer. Thus, incorrect answers are not improperly reinforced.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that the newly submitted claims are patentable over both Braunberger *et al.* and Parry *et al.*

### CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Hoyt A. Fleming III  
Hoyt A. Fleming III  
Registration No. 41,752

Date: December 21, 2006

<b>Address correspondence to:</b> <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> <i>Customer Number or Bar Code Label</i>  <b>28422</b>	<b>or</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Correspondence Address Below</i>  Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP P.O. Box 140678 Boise, ID 83714	<b>Direct telephone calls to:</b>  Hoyt A. Fleming III (208) 336-5237
--	--	--